

I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-6 UNDER 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) based on *Kanbe* in view of *Kumashiro*. This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 of the present application defines an image reader which includes a second standard white board used *to correct the quantity of irradiation light* of the readout section, based on the reflected light from the second standard white board. Similarly, claim 2 refers to using the second standard white board *to correct the quantity of irradiation light* of the readout section, based on the reflected light from the second standard white board. Also relatedly, claims 4 and 5 refer to a second standard white board used to perform *correction of the quantity of irradiation light* of the readout light source.

Kanbe and *Kumashiro* differ from the invention of claims 1-6 in that a second standard white board is not provided so as to *correct the quantity of irradiation* of the readout section (light source) in a document moving mode. Rather, in *Kanbe* and *Kumashiro*, a white datum level is provided so as to *correct the shading correction data* with respect to the sub-scanning direction. The claimed correction of the quantity of irradiation of the readout section is distinct and non-obvious over the correction of shading correction data as taught in *Kanbe* and *Kumashiro*. Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn.

More specifically, in *Kanbe* the second white datum-level 5Y is provided so as to *correct the shading correction data* with respect to the sub-scanning direction. In other words, *Kanbe* corrects the shading correction data based on the pre-line data and pro-line data read out of the second white data-level 5Y so as to delete a difference between the pre-line data and the pro-line data. (See, e.g., Abstract).

As a result of such difference in purpose between *Kanbe* and that of the present invention, *Kanbe* does not teach or suggest “a control section controls the readout section..., so as to *correct the quantity of irradiation light* of said readout section, based on the reflected light from said second standard white board” as recited in claims 1 and 2. Moreover, *Kanbe* fails to teach or suggest “*correction of the quantity of irradiation*

light of said readout light source is performed based on the reflected light from said (second) standard white board” as recited in claims 4 and 5.

Kumashiro discloses that the second reference white plate 20 which would be used in the book scanning mode, is used *to perform the shading correction* in the sheet through scanning mode. (See, e.g., Col. 7, line 66 to Col. 8, line 6). Thus, *Kumashiro* also fails to teach or suggest “a control section controls the readout section..., so as to *correct the quantity of irradiation light* of said readout section, based on the reflected light from said second standard white board” as recited in claims 1 and 2. Moreover, *Kumashiro* fails to teach or suggest “*correction of the quantity of irradiation light* of said readout light source is performed based on the reflected light from said (second) standard white board” as recited in claims 4 and 5.

Accordingly, whether taken alone or in combination, neither *Kanbe* nor *Kumashiro* teach or suggest an image reader or method for correcting the quantity of irradiation light as recited in claims 1-6. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

II. NEW CLAIMS 7-11

New claims 7-11 are considered allowable for at least the same reasons as the claims from which they depend, as well as based on the particular features recited therein.

III. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, all claims 1-11 are believed to be allowable and the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Serial No.: 09/511,548

Should a petition for an extension of time be necessary for the timely reply to the outstanding Office Action (or if such a petition has been made and an additional extension is necessary), petition is hereby made and the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees (including additional claim fees) to Deposit Account No. 18-0988.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP



Mark D. Saralino

Reg. No. 34,243

DATE: March 24, 2003

The Keith Building
1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 621-1113

C:\GEN\FUJ\fuji108.amd.wpd

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Box Non-Fee Amendment, Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231.



March 24, 2003

DATE